

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Session 2015

Legislative Incarceration Fiscal Note

BILL NUMBER: House Bill 793 (First Edition)
SHORT TITLE: Privacy/Up Secret Peeping Punishment.
SPONSOR(S): Representatives Bryan and Faircloth

FISCAL IMPACT

(\$ in millions)

Yes No No Estimate Available

	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
State Impact					
General Fund Revenues:					
General Fund Expenditures					
State Positions:					
NET STATE IMPACT	Likely budget cost. See Assumptions & Methodology section for additional details.				

PRINCIPAL DEPARTMENT(S) & PROGRAM(S) AFFECTED:

Administrative Office of the Courts; Indigent Defense Services; Department of Public Safety

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 1, 2015

TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

None

FISCAL IMPACT SUMMARY:

The proposed bill may have a fiscal impact to address a new chargeable offense being enforced, adjudicated, and having penalties applied to those convicted of the new offense. However, given that there is no historical data on this new offense or similar offenses to use as a proxy for predicting the total number of new offenses, the Fiscal Research Division cannot reasonably estimate the total additional costs that may be incurred. The following costs may be incurred for every one person charged and convicted of this crime:

- Administrative Office of the Courts: \$365-\$501 per disposition
- Indigent Defense Services: \$315-\$353 per disposition
- Department of Public Safety (DPS) - Prison Section: \$2,106 for an active Class I sentence; \$3,510 for an active Class H sentence.
- DPS - Community Corrections: Minimum of \$1,175-\$3,002

Please see the Assumptions and Methodology section for additional information.

BILL SUMMARY:

Under subsection (d) of G.S. 14-202, Secretly peeping into room occupied by another person, it is a Class I felony if any person who, while secretly peeping into any room, uses any device to create a photographic

image of another person in that room for the purpose of arousing or gratifying the sexual desire of any person. This bill amends subsection (d) to include violations for the purpose of harming, intimidating, extorting, threatening, or defrauding another person. Violation of this subsection is a Class I felony.

Under subsection (f) of G.S. 14-202, it is a Class I felony if any person who, for the purpose of arousing or gratifying the sexual desire of any person, secretly or surreptitiously uses or installs in a room any device that can be used to create a photographic image with the intent to capture the image of another without their consent. This bill amends subsection (f) to include violations for the purpose of harming, intimidating, extorting, threatening, or defrauding another person. Violation of this subsection is a Class I felony.

Under existing subsection (i), a second or subsequent offense under this section shall be punished as though convicted of an offense one class higher. In the case of these new offenses, this would be a Class H felony.

The bill is effective December 1, 2015, and applies to offenses committed on or after that date.

ASSUMPTIONS AND METHODOLOGY:

General

The Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission prepares prison population projections for each bill containing a criminal penalty. The Commission assumes for such bills that expanding existing or creating new criminal offenses produces no deterrent or incapacitative effect on crime. Therefore, the Fiscal Research Division does not assume deterrent effects for any criminal penalty bill.

S.L. 2011-192 (H.B. 642), the Justice Reinvestment Act (JRA), made changes to North Carolina's court system, corrections system (both to prisons and probation), and to post-release supervision. All F-I felons are now subject to nine months of post-release supervision (PRS). B1-E felony PRS has been increased from nine months to twelve months. Due to the lack of historical data about JRA implementation, it is not possible to estimate the number of prison beds that may be needed as a result of revocations.

Since the bill creates a new offense, the Sentencing Commission does not have any historical data from which to estimate the impact of this bill on the prison population. It is not known how many offenders might be convicted and sentenced under the new statute.

Judicial Branch

The Administrative Office of the Courts provides Fiscal Research with a fiscal impact analysis for most criminal penalty bills. For such bills, fiscal impact is typically based on the assumption that court time will increase due to anticipated increases in trials and corresponding increases in workload for judges, clerks, and prosecutors. This increased court time is also expected to result in greater expenditures for jury fees and indigent defense.

Registration as a sex offender as the result of a conviction under G.S. 14-202(d) and (f) is not an automatic process. A judge has to make certain findings before placing a defendant on the registry list. Any additional charges and subsequent convictions due to the broadening of these offenses may also require additional hearings on these findings. With additional registrants, there are more possible charges of violating registry requirements, such as failure to register or failure to update address change. AOC does not have historical data upon which to estimate how many additional registrations may be required, or how many registry violations may occur due to this bill.

Subsections (d) and (f) of the bill each create a new Class I felony offense. Because these are new offenses, AOC does not have historical data upon which to estimate the number of charges that might occur. AOC

provides estimates of the average cost to the court for a charge by offense class. For every additional person charged with a Class I felony, the average cost to the court would be \$365. Subsection (i) increases the punishment for a second or subsequent offense to a Class H felony. For every additional person charged with a Class H felony, the average cost to the court would be \$501.

The Office of Indigent Defense Services (IDS) has provided Fiscal Research with the frequency and cost of indigent defense services for each level of crime, including the cost differentials for district and superior court with and without a trial and the percentage of cases handled in each category. Fiscal Research used this data to calculate a weighted average of IDS costs. In FY 2011-12, 68% of Class I cases were handled through IDS. The weighted average cost of a new Class I offense is \$315 per case for a private appointed counsel (PAC) attorney. . In FY 2011-12, 78% of Class H cases were handled through IDS. The weighted average cost of a new Class H offense is \$353 per case for a PAC attorney. This estimate assumes the appointment of a PAC attorney. In districts that have Public Defender offices, cases may be handled by those offices. In those instances, this cost may not be incurred.

Department of Public Safety –Prison Section

The chart below depicts the projected inmate population relative to available prison bed capacity system-wide. Capacity projections assume operation at Expanded Operating Capacity,¹ and represent the total number of beds in operation, or authorized for construction or operation as of December 2014.

Based on the most recent population projections and estimated bed capacity, there are surplus prison beds available for the five-year fiscal note horizon and beyond. Therefore, no additional beds will be required unless the projected number of additional inmates resulting from a bill (row four) exceeds the projected number of beds under the inmate population (row three).

Since the bill creates a new offense, the Sentencing Commission does not have any historical data from which to estimate the impact of this bill on the prison population. It is not known how many beds may be required as a result of this bill. If, for example, there were nine Class I convictions for this proposed offense per year, the combination of active sentences and probation and post-release supervision violations resulting in confinement would result in the need for one additional prison bed the first year and two additional prison beds the second year.

¹ Expanded Operating Capacity (EOC) is: 1) the number of single cells housing one inmate, 2) the number of single cells housing two inmates, and 3) the number of beds in dormitories, allowing between 35 (130% of Standard Operating Capacity) and 50 (SOC) square feet per inmate.

Population Projections and Bed Capacity Five Year Impact					
	June 30 2016	June 30 2017	June 30 2018	June 30 2019	June 30 2020
1. Inmates ²	37,360	37,522	37,348	37,462	37,610
2. Prison Beds (Expanded Capacity)	38,749	38,749	38,749	38,749	38,749
3. Beds Over/(Under) Inmate Population	1,389	1,227	1,401	1,287	1,139
4. Additional Inmates Due to this Bill³	No estimate available				
5. Additional Beds Required					

In addition to the capital costs that may be associated with additional bed needs, there are also per diem costs for housing inmates. The cost to add one additional inmate to the prison system is \$11.53 per day, or \$351 per month, which includes the cost of food, clothing, and health care. In FY 2013-14, 16% of Class I felony offenders received active sentences averaging six months. For every one Class I felony offender receiving an active sentence, the cost to the prison section will be \$2,106 (\$351 monthly cost times six months equals \$2,106). In FY 2013-14, 35% of Class H felony offenders received active sentences averaging ten months. For every one Class H felony offender receiving an active sentence, the cost to the prison section will be \$3,510 (\$351 monthly cost times ten months equals \$3,510).

Department of Public Safety – Community Correction Section

All active sentences for felony offenses now result in a minimum of twelve months of post-release supervision (PRS) for B1-E level offenses and a minimum of nine months of PRS for F-I level offenses. Additionally, for felony offense classes E through I offenders may be given non-active (intermediate or community) sentences exclusively, or in conjunction with imprisonment (split-sentence). Sanctions include electronic house arrest, community service, substance abuse treatment, participation in educational or vocational skills development, payment of court costs, fines, and restitution, and short-term jail sentences not exceeding six days per month.

JRA essentially eliminated the distinction between “community” and “intermediate” supervision. Under structured sentencing, the two types of supervision were each defined by a set of specific sanctions. Under JRA, both community and intermediate probation may now include electronic monitoring, short-term periods of confinement, substance abuse assessment, monitoring, and treatment, participation in educational programs or vocational skills development. Whether a probationer is subject to more stringent conditions is determined by the results of a risk-needs assessment administered by the Department of Public Safety.

All types of post-release supervision are supervised by the Community Corrections Section (CCS); CCS also oversees community service. Supervision by a probation officer costs \$130.50 per offender, per month; no cost is assumed for those receiving unsupervised probation, or who are only ordered to pay fines, fees, or restitution. Total costs are based on average supervision length and the percentage of offenders (per offense class) sentenced to active sentences requiring post-release supervision and supervised probations.

² The Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission prepares inmate population projections annually. These projections are derived from: historical information on incarceration and release rates under Structured Sentencing; crime rate forecasts by a technical advisory group; probation and offender revocation rates; and the decline (parole and max-outs) of the stock prison population sentenced under prior sentencing acts. Projections were updated in February 2015.

³ Criminal penalty bills effective December 1, 2015 should not affect prison population and bed needs until FY 2016-17 due to the lag time between offense charge and sentencing - six months on average. No delayed effect is presumed for the Court System.

In FY 2013-14, 16% of Class I felony offenders received active sentences; 84% received probation. All active sentences result in nine months of post-release supervision (PRS). The average length of probation imposed for this offense class was 23 months. Therefore, at a minimum, one conviction resulting from either subsection (d) or (f) of this bill will require at least nine months of supervision. The cost of nine months of supervision is \$1,175 per offender (\$130.50 per month times nine months).⁴ For every offender sentenced to probation, the average cost would be \$3,002 (\$130.50 per month times 23 months).

In FY 2013-14, 35% of Class H felony offenders received active sentences; 65% received probation. All active sentences result in nine months of PRS. The average length of probation imposed for this offense class was 28 months. Therefore, at a minimum, one conviction resulting from subsection (i) as it relates to subsections (de) or (f) this bill will require at least nine months of supervision. The cost of nine months of supervision is \$1,175 per offender (\$130.50 per month times nine months).⁵ For every offender sentenced to probation, the average cost would be \$3,654 (\$130.50 per month times 28 months).

SOURCES OF DATA: Department of Public Safety; Administrative Office of the Courts; North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission; Office of Indigent Defense Services.

TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS: None

FISCAL RESEARCH DIVISION: (919) 733-4910

PREPARED BY: William Childs

APPROVED BY:

Mark Trogdon, Director
Fiscal Research Division

DATE: April 27, 2015



Signed Copy Located in the NCGA Principal Clerk's Offices

⁴ Due to the effective date of December 1, 2015 and the typical lag time between charge and conviction (6 months), little impact is assumed for CCS in FY 2015-16. Though some offenders may come under CCS supervision during this time, this note assumes an even entry over the course of FY 2016-17.

⁵ Due to the effective date of December 1, 2015 and the typical lag time between charge and conviction (6 months), little impact is assumed for CCS in FY 2015-16. Though some offenders may come under CCS supervision during this time, this note assumes an even entry over the course of FY 2016-17.